

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed June 2, 1999. In that Office Action the application was objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.172(a) in view of the "Consent of Assignee to Filing a Reissue Application" document that was filed with the application. The Examiner stated that the undersigned needed to show the assignee's ownership interest in the application by specifying in the record of the present application the reel and frame number where the document evidencing the assignee's ownership is recorded.

Pursuant to this request the undersigned discussed this matter with the applicant, Mr. Jerry Moscovitch, and learned that the present application is still owned by Mr. Moscovitch, and has never been assigned to Mr. Moscovitch's company, MASS Engineered Design, Inc. This is contrary to the belief of the undersigned at the time the present application was filed. In view of this, it is respectfully requested that the previously filed "Consent of Assignee to Filing of Reissue Application" be withdrawn. This should obviate this ground for rejection and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner also noted that the present application was filed without an offer to surrender the original patent. In response thereto, a supplemental declaration is being submitted herewith in which such a statement is made by the applicant, Mr. Jerry Moscovitch. This should also remove this ground for objection to the application.

Claim 16 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Robak et al (U.S. patent no. D340,235). The Examiner cited Robak et al as showing a display system comprising a pair of display arms, an arm assembly for supporting the displays, support means for supporting the arm assembly and mounting means for mounting the displays to the arm

assembly, with the mounting means being capable of adjusting the angular orientation of each of the displays relative to the arm assembly. This rejection is also respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Initially, it will be noted that new claims 17 and 18 more positively recite that the "mounting means" called for in paragraph C comprises means for adjusting the angular orientation of each of the displays relative to the arm assembly to thereby permit the displays to be angled "toward" each other to a desired degree (claim 17). Claim 18 similarly recites that the mounting means comprises means for adjusting the angular orientation of each of the displays relative to the arm assembly "about a generally vertical axis" to thus permit the displays to be angled relative to each other to a desired degree. These limitations are not shown or suggested by Robak et al. Robak et al is directed to a display console for use in an aircraft. Each of the two display screens are apparently mounted on two members which allow each of the screens to be pivoted about a horizontal axis only. There is no disclosure or suggestion, that the two displays are capable of being angled "about a vertical axis" or "toward" each other. In fact, such a requirement would seem to make no sense for a console used in an aircraft and positioned between two aircraft seats. Presumably, there would be no need to angle the screens towards each other because each screen is intended for an individual seated within a seat directly in front of the screen. In fact, since the arm assembly presents the screen in a position laterally from the console, there would appear to be no need whatsoever for any type of mounting system which provides for adjustment of the screen about a generally vertical axis. Each display appears to be almost directly in front of where an airline seat would be positioned next to the console. Thus, it is submitted that not only does this patent fail to disclose or suggest the apparatus now claimed in new claim 17 and 18, but that the very feature set forth in claims 17 and 18, that being the ability to adjust two screens either towards each other or about a

generally vertical axis, would not even be necessary for the type of application which Robak et al is directed to.

It should also be noted that the specification as originally filed provides ample support for new claims 17 and 18. In column 3, lines 46-54, it is explained that mounting structure 50 mounts one display 16 to permit limited tilting of the display 16 about two mutually perpendicular axes. Mounting structure 52 is stated as coupling the other display 14 to the arm 18 in substantially identical fashion. Column 4, lines 1-11, further recites that the vertical projection 66 permit free rotation of the display 16 "about the vertical axis", but only limited rotation of the display 16 about the horizontal axis. Horizontal projections 68 are stated as being received in horizontally registered slot 64, permitting free rotation of the display 16 about the horizontal axis, but only limited rotation of the display 16 about the vertical axis. It is further stated:

"this arrangement effectively permits
only limited degree of tilting of the
display by two mutually
perpendicular axes, in this
implementation about vertical and
horizontal axes."

From the above, it is submitted that rotation about a generally vertical axis of the two display screens is amply described and supported in the specification of the application.

Applicant also gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 1-15.

Finally, a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is being submitted concurrently herewith.

It is believed that the entire application is now in form for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the earliest possible time. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, he is requested to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600 at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
Attorney For Applicant



Mark D. Elchuk
Reg. No. 33,686

P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600
MDE/jo
August 30, 1999

